CONTENTS

The Dean's Page . . . . . *Dean Merrimon Cuninggim* 3

Methodism and the Catholic Tradition . . . . . *President Umphrey Lee* 4

With All We Have . . . . . *Albert C. Outler* 9

Summer School Instructors — 1952 13

Six Years After . . . . . *James Seehorn Seneker* 14

Faculty Notes . . . . . *Wesley C. Davis* 16

School for Accepted Supply Pastors 18

Alumni Notes 19

Book Reviews 22

THE PERKINS SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY JOURNAL

Editor . . . . . *Thomas H. Marsh*
Alumni News . . . . . *James T. Carlyon*
Book Reviews . . . . . *Fred D. Gealy*
Research Articles . . . . . *Wesley C. Davis*
Campus Activities . . . . . *William A. Irwin*

The Perkins School of Theology Journal is edited for the alumni of the school and for the Methodist ministers of the South Central Jurisdiction. The Publications and Publicity Committee of the School of Theology is in charge of the project.

The Journal is published three times a year, during the Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters, by the Perkins School of Theology, with the approval of The Board of Publications of Southern Methodist University.

Southern Methodist University Press

Volume V WINTER NUMBER 1952 Number II

This photograph, taken from the foyer of our Chapel, shows the marble busts of Mr. and Mrs. J. J. Perkins placed at the entrance to the center aisle.

THE STATE OF THE SCHOOL

By MERRIMON CUNINGGIM

Dean Cuninggim delivered the address below at the Perkins Alumni luncheon during Ministers' Week. The editors are happy to present the address because of the wider audience it will receive from JOURNAL readers.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Ladies and Gentlemen. You have referred, sir, to my newness in the post of Dean. That is as good a place as any to begin my account of the state of the School. My coming from a faculty makes for greater, not less, shock than if I had come from a church. When a minister is fully alert to all the dimensions of his job, he plays, and properly so on occasion, the role of executive; but a professor is an executive to his ruin. Moreover, a professor by profession distrusts, and may even dislike, deans. At least in this regard I was an adequate occupant of a professorial chair, and knew, therefore, what my professorial friend meant when, on my election, he wrote, "Hide your new identity when you come to see us. Our dog is trained to bite deans."

But no one has bitten me; and here, publicly, I wish to express my thanks to all of you, and particularly to my friends of the faculty, for the cordial reception which my wife and I have been given. You have been aware — this is especially true of the faculty — of the large demands upon the post in the light of the rapid growth of the School and its serious understaffing, and thus have been patient with me. I'm reminded of the old Negro who, asked as to what time he went to work, replied, "Go *to* work? Nawsuh, I don't go *to* work. When I gits up in the mawnin', I'se *surrounded* by it."

That all of us at Perkins are surrounded by challenging tasks will become clear as I tell you about some of the School's activities and thoughts of the past few months. Much has taken place, though our program may as yet show little outward evidence of it. But it is not the ongoing program of instruction and administration of which I wish to speak, for most of you know about that in greater or less detail. Before passing by the known features of our School's life, however, I would note that merely the continuance of the familiar tasks has taken quite some doing, in the light of a student body larger than ever before and in crowded — yes, actually crowded conditions — in new Kirby Hall. But it is the extra activity and the thought back of it, that I wish particularly to share with you.

We shall begin where the student begins, with his application for admission. A Faculty Committee on Admissions has been established to set policies and administer them. Under the chairmanship of Professor Outler, they have begun to examine with great care students who apply. Selectivity had already been forced upon the School by the increased numbers of applicants, but the work of this Committee gives confidence that this selectivity

will more and more be based upon a solid assessment of an individual's promise. Grades, interests, mental as well as physical health, financial condition, all these factors and more go into their consideration. Careful judgment on the part of those who know the applicants well may mean most of all. When you are asked, therefore, please write your letters of reference with discrimination, not perfunctorily. Please don't say, "It would be a great personal favor to me if so-and-so is accepted," for it suggests that a personal favor will be necessary in order to get him in.

To select prospective ministers, and then to leave them alone, is no way to do business for the Lord. At present we have almost no resources for adequate academic or personal counseling, but steps are being taken to institute both types, and perhaps there will be something to report at a later time. At any rate, we are aware that adequate admissions policies and adequate counseling of students already admitted must go hand in hand.

To be so concerned about the students is to be made mindful of their reason for being here, the dimensions of their task, and the purpose of the institution devoted to their training. You will be glad to know that the faculty is of one mind that the primary responsibility of the School is to furnish first-class training for the parish ministry. From its establishment this has been the School's chief concern; it is our intention that it continue to be.

But to say "primary" is not to say "sole". Other functions ought also to be performed, as resources permit and as they enhance the central purpose. Thus we look toward the development of special programs in conjunction with the professional one, especially a program of graduate study. But Perkins will never become a graduate school of religion to which a seminary is appended. It will always be a seminary first, with additional offerings and programs of study to make the richest possible environment for future ministers.

I speak with confidence regarding the judgment of the faculty on some of these matters because we have begun a process of sharing our attitudes with each other, and thus are beginning to know what we think and feel. We are embarked on a series of seminars together, in addition to our regular faculty meetings for the conduct of routine business. These seminars have been given over to introspection, looking toward a redefinition, a reorganization, and a revitalization of the program. With great respect for the past and its large achievements, we are aware that new occasions teach new duties, and we mean to be as well prepared for larger opportunities of service as consecrated thought and effort can make us.

I have shared with you one point of view emerging from these sessions, namely, that the primary task is training for the parish ministry. Another consensus is that this training must be composed jointly, not in disjunction, of serious study and guided experience. Field work, the term usually given to the guided experience of the student, must be part of the educational program. It must exist not primarily for the financial aid of the student, nor for some immediate service to a local church, but first and foremost for the educational experience it represents. That our field work program is not so organized now is no criticism of Dr. A. W. Martin; on the contrary, he is doing wonders all by himself. We must get him help. We must make the program an integral part of the educational experience of every student.

Though service is not its chief raison d'etre, field work does represent one important way in which Perkins seeks to serve the Church and the wider constituency. It is our intention to strengthen

and enlarge all such services. We now support or sponsor, wholly or in part, such programs as the School for Accepted Supply Pastors and extension work at Tyler College. This summer we shall inaugurate a seminar for faculty people on the religious perspectives in college teaching. Other such contacts with various people outside our usual student body are in process of being developed. Inviting possibilities open before us; Perkins must be ready to seize them.

As a School, Perkins is related to the University as well as to the Church. We have begun to examine some of the aspects of this relationship. Here is the point at which so many theological schools are falling down. And because they are, their universities don't know where *they* are going. We don't want that said of Perkins and of S.M.U., and Perkins must come to play its full part in the life and philosophy of the whole institution. This is not merely a matter of the elimination of different academic schedules — the quarter system at Perkins versus the semester system in the rest of the University — though that will receive our attention in due time. Of much greater importance is the question as to whether on Perkins' part we recognize our relatedness to the total concerns of the University, and whether from the University's perspective religion is not just part but the *heart* of the enterprise. Perkins wishes to be thought of, and wishes to *be,* an integral institution of the University, free to seize the opportunities and bound to shoulder the obligations which such a relationship entails.

The *heart* of the educational enterprise! Then it must be a beating heart, one through which the life of the Spirit flows richly and with compulsive power. We must look to Perkins' own spiritual vigor, the Christian vitality of the place that makes us more than a School and a collection of human beings at study together. This realization has caused us to focus attention on our chapel services and on other expressions of our corporate life and Christian faith.

Let chapel, for the moment, be the example. Our week-day services are now planned not by a student committee alone but by a group of students and faculty laboring together. The aim is to make chapel not a supplement to the classroom nor an assembly period for the student body, but a worship service. Chapel's chief function, the sharpening and deepening of the sense of worship, is so important that we cannot dare let it be diluted by using the time for presentation of causes however worthy or of lectures however enlightening. We are making progress toward this aim.

There is much else that could be said. Other new committees are at work. New policies with respect to scholarships, the grading system, budgetary allotments, and other matters have been established. But there is time to mention only one more feature of the life of the School at this point in its history. This final item is to the effect that all that has been mentioned and all that must go unsaid illustrate the sense of community which, I truly believe, we feel together. We are moving forward as a body, a family. If not uniformity, there is something perhaps better among us, a cohesiveness. No one person, least of all the new dean, can claim credit for this intention and this fact. It is rather the response of all of us together to the great possibilities that lie ahead of us. If you were to stay among us for a few days, I think you would sense this general dedication to a common cause. I think you would find that Perkins is an exciting place to be just now. I hope you would be glad.

This would be a good stopping point, sir, if the mandate upon me were simply to share with you some of the things hap-

pening at Perkins these days. But I interpret the task you have assigned me as somewhat broader, calling for at least a brief analysis of the causes of this present ferment of thought and action. These causes or explanations constitute our assets, which I wish to enumerate briefly.

Yet what I have to say is not what might be first thought of under such a heading. I do not intend to refer to buildings and material resources, to the noble record of the past and the leaders of the institution in former years, to the devoted service of the faculty heretofore and now, or to the constituency and its faith in the School. These *are* great assets, so great as to be unmeasurable, and Perkins is greatly blessed in its possession of them. But you are aware of their existence; and I mean to call to your attention, instead, two other explanations for the state of present affairs not so tangible nor so immediately apparent to those who do not live and work among us. My reference is to two premises current in the School's life and thought which underlie and undergird all the various activities in which we are engaged. That these premises are conscious ones constitutes an exceptional addition to the assets already named.

The first premise is: *Piety without intellectual competence is dangerous.* Here is a proposition of which large segments of the Church of Jesus Christ have need today. A kind of anti-intellectualism is the fad of some, as if Jesus' command had been to love the Lord with heart and soul and strength but not with mind. But the Methodist Church, thank God, has never said to its institutions of higher education, "Be a school but don't be a very good one." On the contrary, the Church tells us, "Be the best school that you know how to be and that your resources will permit." Individuals and institutions bearing the Methodist name have been known to disregard the demand, but the demand still remains. This counsel we at Perkins mean to follow. That we mean to do so is shown by a number of the steps now being taken, reference to some of which has already been made. We propose to make our offerings strenuous, demanding the very best our students can give in thoughtfulness and hard work. We shall increasingly strive to secure for our student body those who are fully capable to undergo such a program. We intend that the judgment which must be passed on each student's performance be neither unfairly harsh nor sentimentally merciful, but just. We are convinced that piety without intellectual competence is dangerous.

We are equally convinced of the second premise: *Intellectual competence without piety is disastrous.* If failure to recognize the former is sometimes the shame of the Church, failure to recognize this proposition is worse than the shame, it is the tragedy, of the world around us. In other areas of man's endeavor we have intellectual competence in abundance, but decent, honest piety is seldom to be seen. For all their knowledge, men are lost, afraid, desperate, for want of devotion and filial reverence for God, the God that is revealed in Jesus Christ. We at Perkins must not go the way of most flesh. We cannot dispense with the inner light that lighteth every man who will. It is not enough merely to aim at becoming a first-class school; we must become a sanctuary of the Spirit, and a channel through which may flow God's message of judgment and salvation for the world. However high the goal, we cannot set our sights on less; and we ourselves must conform to its requirements in our personal patterns of living, so far as in us lies. This is the faith that informs our actions.

These two premises, then, are basic among us: Piety without intellectual competence is dangerous; intellectual compe-

Concluded on Page 9

REBUILDING THE WORLD

An Interpretation of Ministers' Week

By EARL MARLATT

"Are ye able," said the Master,
"To rebuild the world with me
"Yea," the sturdy dreamers answered,
"Minds and hearts we yield to Thee."

THIS challenge-and-response motif ran like the Scriptural silver cord through the program-pattern of Ministers' Week at Perkins School of Theology, February 4-6, 1952. Without prearrangement it was voiced by every speaker and evoked, without fail, the Biblical reply from the record audiences: "We are able." Accordingly it fulfilled the dramatic and prophetic pledge made by Mrs. J. J. Perkins at the dedication of the Perkins Quadrangle a year ago, when she said: "This is the only way that we can fulfill our dream of better ministers who will go out from this School to build a better world."

With equal clairvoyance and resolution, Bishop A. Frank Smith said at the opening session of the conclave: "When we had the first Fondren Lectures thirty-two years ago, we never dreamed that we would be able to follow through to this bright consummation. Nevertheless, largely through the insight of Dean Hawk and Dr. Lee, plus the faith and generosity of great Christians like Mrs. Fondren, Mrs. Peyton, the Jacksons, and the Perkinses, we have seen that lectureship grow to the shining fruitage of this Ministers' Week."

To this bright challenge Mrs. W. W. Fondren responded with characteristic modesty: "So much for so little is what I think so often about the Fondren Lectures. It has been an increasing joy to me to be able to bring these men of God to you."

Similarly, Mrs. George L. Peyton in her reply marveled that Dean Emeritus Eugene B. Hawk and the School of Theology could so consistently find speakers who were able to establish the new truths of experience on the firm foundation of the old faith.

Mrs. Peyton's appraisal was both justified and illustrated only seconds later, when Dean Merrimon Cuninggim introduced the first speaker on the program, who was, appropriately enough, the Peyton Lecturer, Bishop Richard C. Raines of the Indiana Area of the Methodist Church. His theme was authority in preaching and his argument was drawn from the Scriptural passage which discusses "the mote" and the "beam" or "sawlog", the house which was "built on the sand", and the house which was "built on the rock of a wise man's faith in "Christ, the Redeemer." This is the only foundation, he said, which can give firmness, strength, or authority to a home, a School, or a Church. This is something which rises out of the heart of the good earth as religion springs up in the heart of a

good man, beside which all external authorities, coercions, and controls are as nothing. This and this alone, like "charm" or "love", can make the world a home-like place for men to live in, so that they can say when they pray, "Our Father," and, eventually, "Thy Kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven."

In subsequent lectures Bishop Raines "went a little farther" until he could reveal in all His authority the Fatherly God of Jesus, who not only "forgave sins" but "took it upon Himself" to redeem sinners, and bring them back, like lost sheep, to the fold, their Father's house, home. "For they desire a better country, even a heavenly country; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God."

The latter may still be found today, Bishop Raines pointed out in his amazing last lecture, in those unfortunate countries where people are living in the shadow of totalitarian despotism with its shameless denial of religious liberty. "I found German Methodists in East Germany," the Bishop said, "who told me: 'We hope the third war will come soon; with freedom, some of us may survive.' And when I reached Asia the story was the same. Korean Christians came to me to say: 'We come from north of the 38th parallel; if you Americans hadn't come we wouldn't be alive.' "

Obviously, as Bishop Raines implied, we have not yet built Wendell Wilkie's "one world" of brotherhood but we have laid the foundations on the solid rock of our fathers' faith.

As if by magic — or was it religion? — the Jackson Lecturer on the Bible, Dr. Luther A. Weigle, carried on from here. His subject was "The Revision of the English Bible" based upon his own experiences on the Commission which will publish, this fall, *The Revised Standard Bible.* In his first lecture he asserted that the new translators had endeavored to stay as close as possible to the King James version of the Scriptures within the limits of the findings of modern scholarship. This is important, Dr. Weigle pointed out, because the King James version had relied so heavily upon the Tyndale translation which was made not from the Vulgate or Latin text, but from the earlier Greek and Hebrew texts which had just been retored to research and religion by the scholars of the Renaissance. Thus the Revised Standard Version goes courageously back to first sources in order to recover, not just the text, but the meaning and spirit of the Scriptures as they grew naturally out of their ancient background and may be translated, just as naturally, into living speech and experience today.

Dean Weigle proved conclusively that the new translation is in no sense a revolution but rather a return "to the clear disciplined prose" of the Tyndale text. It seeks to give the literal historic meaning, "the bare text," of the Scriptures with the hope that the common people will understand it and know it to be the word of God. In this way they can most freely and naturally add knowledge to faith, "and to knowledge virtue."

The Fondren Lecturer, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, was long in sounding the clarion theme of the program — "rebuilding the world" — but when he struck it the anvil of God rang with his terrible hammer-blows. Man of himself can do nothing, he contended. Selfhood, personality is dual, the natural man and the reasoning man. The two may work together toward a third, the mystery man or soul, but here they are stopped by their own finitude in the presence of something more than nature and reason, God.

"Man must ever strive to understand the nature of things," Dr. Niebuhr said, "and until his final judgment, man must live by faith and wait upon God's will for that grace which He alone can

bestow." This is the only way the new creature can be released, the new world revealed and built.

Curiously or miraculously all of this became less mysterious and more concrete at the Alumni Luncheon in the Activities Building of the Highland Park Methodist Church; for here the major motif of Ministers' Week — "Lord, we are building" — suddenly reached a climactic crescendo. Dean Merrimon Cuninggim, presented by Dr. Harrison Baker, president of the Perkins Alumni Association, set forth briefly the basic principle of his new administration at the School of Theology.

"We start," he said, "from the fundamental belief that piety without intellectual competence is dangerous and intellectual competence without piety is disastrous. We shall go on from there until we have fulfilled the Wesleyan prescription for ministerial training set in letters of light in the old building of the School: 'Let us unite the two so long divided, knowledge and vital piety."

Then by way of making the word flesh and the dream a reality, Dean Cuninggim announced that Mr. and Mrs. J. J. Perkins, with the consent of President Umphrey Lee and the Board of Trustees of Southern Methodist University, had established a fund to provide a new classroom and office building for Perkins, to be called Selecman Hall in honor of Bishop Charles C. Selecman, to which would be added an activities room not unlike the one in which the Alumni Luncheon was being held. This latter, it was explained, was the especial concern of Mrs. Perkins, teacher and friend of teachers, who a year before had said: "Our vision of learning and service must match the splendor of these buildings."

After that no benediction was needed for either the Alumni Luncheon or Ministers' Week; for those with "ears that hear" the choral response was already ringing all around them:

Lord, we are building
Thy Temple of Truth;
One purpose binding
Age, prime, and youth.
Our Master-Builder
Forever shall be
Christ Jesus the Lord
Of earth and sky and sea.

Concluded from Page 6

tence without piety is disastrous. You will help us, I am sure, never to forget either. Those of you who walked the halls of old Kirby will remember that embedded in the flooring of the central foyer is a quotation from John Wesley: "Let us unite the two so long divided, knowledge and vital piety." Old Kirby is now part of the Law School, as you know. One would not, if he could, deprive the Law School of Wesley's insight. The inscription is still there, and still working its high, hard, God-fearing way into the thinking of those who tread upon it. But the thought has been moved with the removal of Perkins to its new location. We mean to continue to be responsive, we mean to be ever more responsive, to its challenge — "Let us unite the two so long divided, knowledge and vital piety."

THE WITNESS OF THE CHURCH

By JAMES T. CARLYON

Dr. Carlyon is Professor of Christian Doctrine in the Perkins School of Theology, and has been Alumni Editor for the JOURNAL *since its beginning. He has recently completed seven years of daily broadcasting of sermonettes over WFAA, Dallas.*
THE EDITOR

SINCE the World Conferences of 1937, repeatedly we have heard the call, "Let the Church be the Church." (It may have been the contribution of John Mackay of Princeton.) Before we are ready to discuss the "Witness of the Church" we may need to consider the prior question, "What is the Church, its nature and function?" Such a question as that of the relation of Church and State will get significant answer only as we keep in mind what we mean by the Church. The troublesome matter of flying the Stars and Stripes within the sanctuary of the Church may need to be preceded by the inquiry, "Why should a Church fly any flag?" Not the question, whether to fly a national flag, but a basic issue arises first, "Is the Church an institution which properly displays a flag after the custom of nations or political units of different sizes?"

Perhaps the deeper application of the slogan, "Let the Church be the Church," will have to do with the achieving of the experience of a Fellowship between the divine Lord and his human co-workers. On the local level, we may well ask whether the Church or Society is a living organism, in which the vitalizing Center is the incarnate God. Are we bound together as a worshipping congregation in different fashion from other societies? Are we human persons caught up into an experiencing communion, in which we see ourselves and each other as members together of the Body of Christ? At the higher level of the city or the community, we must continually face the deep question whether we have achieved a genuine Fellowship in which women and men of various beliefs and traditions and forms of worship are bound together in the Lord, one Lord, one Spirit, one God. Does the community know us as together the Fellowship, in which the Person of Jesus Christ is honored and his Spirit regnant? At the world level the same ideal must be exalted.

"I have called you friends, for all that I have heard from my Father I have made known to you. You did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you that you should go and bear fruit and that your fruit should abide; so that whatever you ask the Father in My name, He may give it to you. This I command you, to love one another." (John 15:15-17)

This conception of the Church, as found in the Gospel according to John, has other good support from New Testament writers. Put into simple statement, the Church is a Fellowship; at its center, historically, was Jesus of Nazareth; gathered about him were women and men personally devoted to a Master and Teacher and Leader; together they were committed to the divine dream of the coming Kingdom of God. This was the living Church at the first. After the death of Jesus, the Spirit of the Living God, the same Spirit who

had been present in the Man of Nazareth, took the place of the human Leader. The Church became a Fellowship of the Spirit of God with women and men, sharing in the ideals and teachings of Jesus, committed to the coming of the Kingdom of God upon the earth. That remains to this day the essential nature of the Church, a Divine-Human organism. No matter how high and noble a fellowship of women and men may be, they are not a Christian Church unless there is the central Figure who is more than they. It must be the Church of the Living God or to use the New Testament phrase, 'the Body of Christ,' or the Church of the Spirit, or a Communion of Saints devoted to their living Lord, who is the Eternal God.

The Church, then, is a unique institution or organism; differing from every other organization or fellowship or society; a sort of ideal for every other grouping of human persons. Our dream is of a world family or of an ecumenical fellowship, in which the immanent or incarnate God shall be Father and Lord and Companion.

The living Church, this Fellowship on the earth, may give its first and persistent witness to the reality, the pertinence and the presence of God. In other words, the witnessing Church is first a worshipping Church. Its God is not only the theoretical conclusion of a syllogism, but real and vital and present. He is not merely the subjective reaching out and up of the human spirit, but the Objective Being and Lord of our Lives. He is beyond the God of logic, he is the God of personal acquaintance.

The final session (1950) of the Federal Council of Churches at Cleveland, Ohio, received and listened with serious concern to a report under the caption, "The Christian Conscience and Weapons of Mass Destruction." As the subject required it had to do mainly with the attitudes of the individual Christian in these difficult days. But the Commission, of which Bishop Angus Dun was chairman, and which numbered nineteen of the more thoughtful Christian leaders of our time, closed with a challenge to the Church or churches.

"The special task of the churches in our time as in every time is to cry out to men, 'Behold your God.' It is in beholding the forgiveness without which our moral burden would be intolerable. And in receiving His forgiveness we can win the power to forgive those who trespass against us. Beholding Him, we can be delivered from the ultimate fears and hysteria out of which no wisdom can come for meeting the terrors of our time. Before Him we dare to believe that we have a citizenship which no human weapons can destroy. From Him who 'would fold both heaven and earth in a single peace' there comes even in our darkness that strange word, 'Be not anxious.'"

I believe the Commission has said the one important word for the topic being discussed in this paper. This world of ours has no need like its need for God, no hunger like its hunger for the Eternal, no hope except as it finds its way into the presence of the Creative and Redemptive Spirit. We must bear witness to God. We must bring human persons with all their finiteness and imperfections, with all their lostness and confusion, to God. We must so witness that others will seek the rich experience we report.

The most damaging indictment against the Protestant Church service of worship, which has come to my notice, was written by that strange Danish theologian, Soren Kierkegaard. Morbid and crippled of soul himself, the son of a Lutheran bishop, he has yet stimulated the modern world as few Christian thinkers since the Reformers. Using the figure of the theater as his pattern, he has charged the average Evangelical service of worship with a strange reversal of direction. The minister and

the choir have prepared carefully for their task of ministering to a congregation; they will measure the success of their performance primarily by what the people have to say about their hour-long entertainment. God may be present somewhere, perhaps in the wings, looking on. Instead of this betrayal, Kierkegaard insists that the worshipping congregation shall think of themselves as the actors upon the stage. God is the audience; choir and preacher are addressing Him; every part of the service is directed towards Him; the final judgment upon the hour must come from Him. The Minister and the Choir and the Ushers and everyone else must think of themselves as helpers of the congregation in its endeavor to please God. Their praise is to Him, their prayer is for His ears, the Offering is for the promotion of His will in the world. Neither Preacher nor Singer must get between the people and the God they worship.

Christian witnessing must exalt the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Fatherly Sovereign of the universe and of men in particular. Our God must ever have the human colors and the graces of a historical Person; he must be a "Christ-like God." That means at least that the Church shall invite and welcome men into the presence of friendliness and understanding and goodness surpassing that of their other human associations. The implications from this fundamental conviction are clear. We pray "in the name of Jesus" and we gather in churches called "Christian" with the assumption of a quality of the Fellowship that will enrich and encourage and comfort and befriend all who gather within the radius of its influence. We witness fairly and fully only in proportion as the Fellowship itself exhibits these finer qualities of gracious and forgiving persons. The Minister in the pulpit may be the voice of the congregation, or he may be the prophet of God; but in either case, his speech must be sustained by the manner of behavior of those who with him make up the congregation. That is to say, the impressive witness is borne by the whole group; and it includes many forces and figures, many influences and activities. The witness is a total witness; the Church as a Fellowship shares the essential nature of its living Head and Lord; the Christian God is given testimony and living demonstration again as in the "days of his flesh." In deeper fashion than we sometimes realize, the Church is and of necessity must be the continuing incarnation, carrying forward the revelation of God so wonderfully made by Jesus Christ. It is the same Church, the same God, the same Word-made-flesh, the same spiritual Fellowship as in the first century. John Knox has given us a difficult but an enormously important concept, when he insists that the Lord Jesus Christ is an *Event,* including the person of Jesus of Nazareth, but also the whole movement which he began and which continues in the Church.

What John Knox seems to mean, if I understand him, is that we can never dissociate Jesus of Nazareth from the social and historical whole of which he is forever the center. The Jesus we know is not some exact historical individual, who is somehow to be constructed out of careful and critical analysis of the documents. The Jesus we know and the Jesus that men of all ages will know and need to know is the Figure remembered, interpreted, and carried forward by the Church. It is vain and perhaps quite unnecessary that we shall subtract from the Gospels a "Jesus of History" as a former generation sought to do. He will forever be the Jesus of the Church, the Christ of experience, the Lord of all Christian living. Not that there was not a kernel person and a kernel teaching, but we shall find it hopeless to disentangle that kernel. It would also be quite superfluous to make the attempt. We must always know Jesus through his

interpreters, through the people who loved and followed him. He will mean to us somewhat as he signified then. In the long movement of Judeo-Christian religion, God was seeking to get something done, something tremendously important for us men. What he did then he is continuing to do now. The living Church, the Church of our experience, is still the remembering and the interpreting Church. The figure of Jesus Christ becomes luminous and redemptive as a Christian Fellowship now remembers and interprets him, not so much in his words or in his figure, but in the quality of life and the spirit of redemptive service of the Fellowship itself.

The Church then, which witnesses to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, must carry at its heart this glorious Person, who not only lived in the first century, but comes alive in every century in the sacred communion which bears his name. It is thus a living witness.

In the third place, the Church has a witness which is Eternal as well as historical. The Spirit which was in Jesus is the Spirit of the Eternal God, and that God is as loving forever as Jesus was in the first century. That God is forever the seeking Shepherd and the Good Physician and the patient Father waiting for the return of the Prodigal. The Roman Catholic Church has followed the logic of its doctrine of God by arranging an elaborate system of penance and of confession by which estranged and sinful men may be brought within the saving orbit of the forgiving God. We may be critical of some aspects of that system, but it is appropriate to ask whether we of the Evangelical faith have provided as wisely for the return of the Prodigal. It may be that the common teachings of the Unpardonable Sin and of an eternal Hell will run counter to the fundamental conception of a God who is everlastingly the Father of our Lord Jesus. The Master who counselled the forgiving act up to seventy times seven was certainly saying that there could be no stopping place in the forgiving spirit. The Revelation picture of the Lake of Fire and its accompanying description of Jesus as the Destroyer of sinners may nullify the whole Sermon on the Mount teaching on forgiveness. These doctrines scarcely fit into the nature of a divine Redeemer and Infinite Goodness whose best description is expressed in the word Love (or Agape). Once the quality of love, "the outgoing energy of good will" as defined by C. H. Dodd, becomes central in the nature of God and in the spirit of His Church, certain common notions become obsolete. Nels F. S. Ferre in *Evil and the Christian Faith* (Harper, 1947) startles the reader with the question, whether Heaven would not be "an eternal place of mourning," if loved ones were consigned forever to Hell. Only an "empty hell" would seem congruous with a true Heaven.

It follows necessarily that our God is the ultimate Redeemer. The grace and forgiveness of Jesus were revealings of the eternal grace and forgiveness. The love that died for us, that did not stop even at a cross; that love is essentially the love of God. There is no place for God to stop; He is Savior always and forever; salvation is the goal of His purpose and the end of creation. Redemption is not an afterthought of the Divine Creator. Love is not an appendage to judgment. If Jesus Christ should "return" to the earth in what is commonly called The Second Advent, he must be the same loving Lord that he was in his first advent. We must insist, "Jesus Christ the same, yesterday, today, and forever."

The Church which witnesses to its loving Lord must be itself a loving and a redeeming organism. Norman Pittenger (*The Christian Way in a Modern World,* Cloister Press, 1944) would have us think of the Church less as a society of the saved and more as a "society of saviors." Our chief goal should be the redemption

of others, rather than the redemption of ourselves. We are truly saved only as we forget ourselves in the concern for other men. Even salvation cannot be a selfish thing.

The witness of the Church thus centers in God and its task is to bring human persons into the divine Presence. It has become a common practice to draw a picture of a Church in a community, with lines reaching out in every direction and with arrows pointing to family, to education, to the care of the poor, to social and economic orders, to the state. The preachment has called for the Church to serve the community in its every facet of need. We have sometimes said that the Church must lose itself in the service to society. We have spoken of it as the great social service agency. If the foregoing emphasis has been sound, then we need to reverse the direction of these lines; we must put the arrows at the other end of each line. The Church will be the Savior of society, not by its efforts to serve society directly. Its salvation comes by indirection. Too much of our theology has assumed that man is the goal and end of creation, that all institutions must be measured in terms of their direct service to man. That is not true of the Christian Church. God is the chief Value and the high Good. The Church saves the world by lifting it into the Presence of God. The Church exists to serve God, rather than to serve men. Its goal is the Kingdom of God, rather than the kingdoms of this world. The Church has its primary concern with women and men as the eternal children of the eternal God. It must never seek man's material or physical welfare as its chief end; it must not make itself the servant of any community. It saves by lifting. It summons the individual man to rise into the place of reverence and of prayer, there to discover himself in his true nature as a child of God. It calls the institutions of the community and of the contemporary scene to examine themselves in the light of God and in consideration of man's estate as that of a son of God. Its spires point upward and its cross calls to men to love and to serve each other and their God.

As the sons of God realize their own eternal nature and destiny, they count membership in the Kingdom of God their prized distinction. They have passed from the realm of death to that of life. They are not limited by space and time, even though their bodies know such restrictions. The Church is a society of immortals; their wealth cannot be material, even as their concern cannot be primarily with earthly things. The Church does not fear for the death of the saints, for it knows that beyond death is the Life Abundant. The human society in which we all move needs ever the lifting power of a Church which refuses to measure in terms of things, which interprets the every day in the light of eternity. The Church witnesses continually to the eternal, even as it looks constantly to the Eternal God; it must make women and men aware of themselves as the eternal children of the Eternal God. Then, and then only, can the Church be in the world, but not of the world. The fears of death have been overcome through the abiding faith in the Eternal God.

This paper has been concerned with the Witness of the Church and not at all with the witness of the Christian individual. Each of us will seek to express his true self in every situation. Whether in business or in labor or in some professional task we shall be Christian persons. As such we shall draw inspiration and shall know our direction, because we are members of the Fellowship, of the Body of Christ.

RELIGION IN THE MAKING OF THE CONSTITUTION

By WILLIAM W. SWEET

The following article was taken from a chapter in Doctor Sweet's forthcoming RELIGION IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN CULTURE. *The publication date for this latest of Doctor Sweet's books is May 26.* THE EDITOR

NUMEROUS studies dealing with the political and economic factor in the making of the Constitution have appeared over the years, but there has been little attention given to the religious influences in the framing and adoption of the fundamental law of the land. The framers of the Constitution represented a cross-section of the American religious bodies of that day. Of them, nineteen were Episcopalians, eight were Congregationalists, seven were Presbyterians, two were Roman Catholics, two were Quakers, one a Methodist, one a Dutch Reformed while Edmund Randolph was a deist, though he later became a communicant of the Episcopal Church. The only direct reference to religion in the body of the Constitution is the clause proposed by Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, "That, no religious tests or qualifications shall ever be annexed to any oath of office under the authority of the United States", which as finally reworded and adopted, became Article VI of the Constitution and reads:

> No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

There was little debate over this article in the Convention, although Roger Sherman of Connecticut observed that he considered the prohibition unnecessary because he believed the "prevailing liberalism" was sufficient security against such tests being ever required. In several of the state ratifying conventions, however, this clause received considerable attention.[1]

In the course of the discussion in the state ratifying conventions there were three points of view expressed. The first favored the Article on the ground that religious tests were dangerous in that they might lead to persecution. It was also argued that such matters should be left to the states. One member stated that Christ did not need worldly authority to support his religion and that the only way to secure political unity was to leave religion "free and unshackled." Permitting the offices to be held by men of various religions encouraged religious freedom and was a bar to an established church. A second position supported the requiring of tests in order to keep dangerous and unworthy people from holding important offices. Otherwise might not "popish priests" as well as Mohammedans hold office? The only safety, therefore, lay in guaranteeing that office holders be men who believe in God. A third group took the position that the article did not furnish a sufficient guarantee of religious liberty and asked that a Bill of Rights be added to the Constitution guaranteeing religious freedom and the separation of church and state. This group also deplored the omission of any mention of God in the Constitution and at least five states in their conventions

[1]Anson Phelps Stokes, *Church and State in the United States*, 3 vols., New York, 1950. Vol. I, Chapters VII and VIII furnish full coverage of all the religious issues involved in the making and amending of the Constitution.

expressed regret at the absence of any reference to the Christian religion.

In the state ratifying conventions the question of religious tests was ably discussed, but especially so in those of Massachusetts and New Hampshire. Daniel Shute, a Massachusetts Baptist, made this remarkably liberal statement in the course of the debate:

> Far from limiting my charity and confidence to men of my own denomination in religion, I suppose, and I believe sir, that there are worthy characters among men of every other denomination — among the Quakers, the Baptists, the Church of England, the Papists and even among those who have no other guide in the way of virtue and heaven, than the dictates of natural religion.

The New Hampshire convention proposed twelve amendments, one of which, the eleventh, closely resembles the first part of what later became the first amendment. The high point in the Virginia convention was the debate between James Madison and Patrick Henry. Patrick Henry opposed ratification without an amendment guaranteeing religious freedom, while Madison was for ratification on the ground that the Federal government possessed no power to infringe on religious liberty which he considered safe in the hands of the states. Randolph and Madison expressed their confidence that the great variety of religious bodies in the nation would be a perpetual safeguard against infringement on religious freedom. Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Virginia, North and South Carolina, New York and Rhode Island, however, all recommended that a specific guarantee of religious liberty be added to the Constitution.

In response to a well-nigh universal desire that an amendment be added to the Constitution specifically safe-guarding religious freedom, four days after the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States, James Madison gave notice that he was prepared to submit amendments to the Constitution, and it was understood that these amendments would be a *Bill of Rights.* He stated that it was well known that many Americans were dissatisfied with the Constitution as adopted because it did not contain "effectual provisions against encroachments on particular rights, and those safeguards to which people had long been accustomed". The result was the submission of what came to be the first ten Amendments. After a lengthly consideration, the House came to an agreement, and the Amendments were sent to the Senate on August 24, 1789. A month later they were submitted to the states and on June 15, 1790, the requisite number having ratified the amendments, they thereupon became a part of the fundamental law of the land.

The First Amendment, with which we are particularly concerned here, reads:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

As Anson Phelps Stokes has pointed out, all the rights mentioned in the Amendment are interrelated and all have to do with religion; freedom of speech guarantees the right to preach; freedom of the press the right to publish religious tracts, periodicals and books; the freedom of assembly assures the right of the people to come together for worship.

The purpose of the First Amendment, as Justice Joseph Story has stated, was not to injure Christianity, but

> to exclude all rivalry among Christian

> sects and prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment which should give to any hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government.

A more recent statement prepared by a solicitor of the Department of State in 1910 fully concurs with Judge Story that

> the (First) Amendment of the Constitution and the like provisions in the State Constitutions were not dictated by indifference or hostility to the principles of the Christian religion, however spread, but to establish upon a firm footing the right before the law of every religious sect.

Arguments have been advanced, recently, mostly by Catholic writers, that the constitutional fathers had no intention of denying government support to the religious bodies, but only to prohibit special treatment of one religious body in preference to others. A Jesuit scholar, Father Winfred Parsons in his book *The First Freedom; Considerations on Church and State in the United States* (1948) contends that the first amendment had to do solely with guaranteeing religious freedom and that the framers had no intention of completely separating church and state. The records of the proceedings of Congress, however, during the consideration of the amendment show conclusively that the Congress was thinking in terms of the complete separation of the church from the state.

Charles Austin Beard in his *Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* advances the thesis that economic factors had a determining part to play in the adoption of the Constitution, since members of the ratifying state conventions who favored the Constitution pretty generally were security holders or had reason to believe that they would profit economically from its adoption. A study of those who opposed the adoption of the Constitution and their grounds for their opposition explodes the Beard contention. The Presbyterians opposed the adoption of the Constitution with an almost complete unanimity. Their opposition was principally due to their fear of the possibility of established churches in the several states, since their experience of the restrictions imposed by the Church of Ireland was still fresh in their memories. Baptist members of the state conventions were also generally anti-Federalists because they feared the Constitution did not sufficiently safeguard religious freedom. The Piedmont region of Virginia, a stronghold of Baptist dissenters, voted twenty-eight to two against ratification. In March, 1788, the Virginia Baptist Association voted unanimously in favor of a resolution stating that the Constitution did not offer sufficient safeguards for their rights.

Pennsylvania furnishes further refutation of the Beard thesis. The ratifying convention was composed of members representing a cross-section of Pennsylvania's cosmopolitan religious makeup. The two Morrises and Jared Ingersoll were Episcopalians, Thomas Mifflin was a Quaker, Thomas Fitzsimmons was a Catholic, Benjamin Franklin, raised a Congregationalist was a nominal Episcopalian but thought of as a Deist. There were also Moravians, Lutherans, Baptists, Methodists, a Huguenot Calvinist and a German Reformed, but most were Presbyterians. A Lutheran minister, Frederick Augustus Conrad Muhlenberg, the son of the Lutheran patriarch, Henry M. Muhlenberg, was the president of the convention. There were twenty-three who voted against ratification, and of the fourteen whose religion is ascertainable, five were Presbyterians, three were German Lutherans or Reformed, one was a Moravian, and one, Abraham Lincoln, was a Congregationalist. Three of the Presbyterians who voted against ratification were security

Concluded on Page 38

SIN AND HISTORY

By WILLIAM A. IRWIN

I HAVE just this minute come from the fourth of Reinhold Niebuhr's lectures in our "Ministers' Week" program (which will explain the strange collocation of ideas in my title). I ought to be in a blue funk — it has been a most depressing experience — and I would be, except that I disavow most emphatically Niebuhr's basic categories of thought. The lectures were brilliant, delivered with all the force, oratorical and physical, and with the cleverness for which he is widely known; they manifested richly his breadth of knowledge and agility of mind. They came also, at point after point, to telling presentation of some of the profound things in our Christian faith. All this to the good. Yet for their total impress I am deeply disturbed. Certain lines of his thinking, if they should become dominant in our religious life, would entail consequences which can be anticipated only with grave misgivings.

Niebuhr is for our day the great prophet of sin! For him man is essentially a mean wretch, a silly little bombast who parades about in an assumed greatness that he has never remotely approached. He is a creature of empty and overweening pride, pride of his intellect, pride of his goodness, pride even of his humility; while in reality he is a creature of the blackest impulses, with apparently scarcely a single redeeming quality of his own. And the one hope of his ever becoming moderately respectable lies in that great miracle of grace in which his old self dies and he is reborn a new self. Unfortunately, even this transformation is only partial; his mean qualities continue to the end, for he is still a creature of sin although by divine goodness redeemed and, it is to be hoped, "made meet for the saints in light". I need not elaborate; everyone familiar with Niebuhr's thinking can fill in the details. All that is important is that I have, so I believe, been fair to his outlook.

It would be a gross exaggeration to quote Horace at this point, yet in reality the company Niebuhr keeps is indicated by the line,

"Odi vulgum profanum et arceo."

But as well there has been much in my mind through this experience a passage in Van Wyck Brooks' recent *The Confident Years,* in which he shows how two contradictory attitudes toward human life have run side by side through modern literature, right into that of our own times. He takes Flaubert and George Sand as symbols of these; the latter believed in the essential goodness of man and his high possibilities for betterment; but Flaubert, interested only in the priveleged few, despised the common crowd and dismissed them to Satan's power. For Brooks the distinction runs through all life; also his examples are that and no more. In reality the cleavage is immensely older; it is the contrast of Ecclesiastes and Proverbs 1-9, and thousands of years earlier, of Sumer and Egypt. Men are separated, one on the right hand and the other on the left, by their philosophy of man.

So then the matter stands out in historic perspective. Niebuhr is a "Flaubertian"; or with the modern vogue of qualifications, should we say, a neo-Flaubertian? In any case his prototype John Calvin is fully within the aristocratic theory of man: salvation is for only the few elect; the rest are quite literally consigned to Satan. And it is Calvin's gloomy theory of man that has been, whether consciously or not, the model and inspiration of Niebuhr's gospel of sin.

One matter in his emphasis deserves brief delay. The prime expression of man's sinfulness, that of his pride, is that he rejects his creatureliness and seeks to rival God; he wants to become creator. I confess I am in grave difficulties to understand what this means; or if it means anything of significance, then simply I don't believe it! This is not a human characteristic — if Niebuhr's words mean what they say. The great mass of people, the abstract *man,* accepts the facts of life; he is subject to the weather, he suffers want and desire, and pain and disease, age creeps on, and presently he dies, and my observation is that people accept this as inevitable, seeking only to mitigate the worst of the conditions, and to postpone as long as possible the ultimate dissolution. Surely Dr. Niebuhr does not mean to make a general attack on the scientific achievement of our time, and label it, holus bolus, as the quintessence of sin. In man's increasing mastery of the forces of his environment and subjection of them to his will there lies the only real basis that I can see for the charges he makes. Is it a mark of man's perverse "pride" that he seeks to mitigate pain and to postpone death? Would it be sinful — to take a flight into the fanciful — if science were to master death? It would create incalculable social problems; as matters now stand, death is the kindly minister of human well-being. But that is incidental; what we want to know is would Dr. Niebuhr call it sin? I find it difficult to believe so; but otherwise I can see no relevance whatever in his charges.

Niebuhr's basic error inheres in his use of the Bible. I find no evidence whatever that he does the hard, solid drudgery of Bible study on which alone sound exegesis can be based. Instead he leaps lightly, and brilliantly, to astonishing interpretations of passages and summaries of Biblical thought. On closer examination these are seen to be essentially the mediaeval proof-text method of Bible study. His Calvinism — whether neo or original — has fixed his outlook, and then he goes back — honestly, I have not the least doubt — to find Biblical passages which support the views to which he has already come. This is precisely the reverse, it need scarcely be noted, of sound Biblical interpretation, for which the basic question is what the Biblical authors really thought and said, let that effect or qualitfy our dogmas as it may.

The disastrous result of his methodology is that Niebuhr has never risen to the majesty and exaltation of the Biblical doctrine of man. I am aware that I am criticising the author of the greatest theological dissertation of our time on the nature of man; yet even so, truth must be spoken. In so far as I am able to judge from these recent lectures, his error, apart from the wider defect of method, hinges upon his easy dismissal of the narrative in Genesis 3. He takes the position that the story is not again referred to in the Old Testament. But what of that? It was certainly known and employed as basic by a Jew so well instructed as Paul. Still more significant, it fits into and is an integral part of a pervasive course of ancient thought, long antedating Israel's national existence, in such a way that we are obliged to see here an accepted orientation of Old Testament thinking.

The ancient East had long pondered the problem of man's likeness to the beasts while at the same time he was so different. An expression of this is the story of Engidu, the boon companion of Gilgamesh: beast with the beasts, yet presently transformed through civilizing influences into a man. Artistically the problem found expression in the great series of compound monsters in the religious symbolism of the entire ancient world. The answer to the problem is found, however, in stories about Ea, about Osiris (though apparently very late) and, leaving the Orient for a moment, in the great Greek myth of Prometheus. All alike answer that man's uniqueness lies in his possession of a divine quality; for the East, characteristically it was knowledge, but Prometheus stole the fire of the gods and gave it to man. The myths are all alike in that the acquisition of this divine quality set man off on his course of civilization. Before this he was a mere beast; now he does things that mark him off as human.

In this, it will be seen, there was an astonishing foreshadowing of the knowledge that has come to us through prehistoric anthropology, but is probably more familiarly spoken of as biological evolution. Man emerged through inestimably long ages, then climbed slowly upward from culture to culture, until at length he burst forward into the wonders of civilization in Sumer and in Egypt and then into that of the West.

It will already have been recognized that into this pattern of thought Genesis 3 fits exactly; it is the Hebrew myth of civilization. Man lived in the garden in idyllic simplicity — a more pleasant word for the reality of beastliness — until Eve rebelled against the prospect of eternal mediocrity, and she and her husband ate of the tree of knowledge. At once, just as in the other stories, they became civilized: more to the point, they became human. It is the Hebraic way of telling of what was freely recognized to be the epochal forward step of the race; in one moment man made greater progress than in aeons otherwise.

But what was the act which brought this about? Merely that man asserted his will, for weal or woe, against the will of God. It was not pride; it was rebellion. Such is very frequently the Biblical view of sin; however, it is relevant to note that the common word in both Testaments means basically the missing of the mark. Think of it; to sin is merely to miss the mark! How far this is from Niebuhr's theory of pride and his heavy theological emphasis on the primacy of sin. This first rebellion brought man his freedom; in that was his sin, for sin and freedom are inseparable. Merely to possess a will over against the will of God — whatever one may do with it is incidental for the moment — for man to be able to stand up in his right, mere speck on animated dust that he is, and declare in the face of Almighty God, "I'll do it or not, just as I decide" — there is the essence of sin, and there is the profound reality of original sin. We are born in iniquity, because we are creatures of free will. This is our doom — and our glory. If we were other than sinners we would be less than human. The "fall" was a glorious fall — upward!

This is mythology, it will be recognized; but like all true mythology it is profound in its depiction of deepest human realities. In a high and magnificent way that shames literalist claims for Biblical veracity, the story is true: of the very essence of man's living truth. For, to mix two myths, thus man was made in the image of God (though this is scarcely the thought of Genesis 1); he became a being like God, fit to companion with him, a view on which the patriarchal stories constitute commentary: Abraham was "the friend of God; Moses saw him face to face — myths again, but true.

Such then is the essential nature of sin, though this new-found freedom of man could and did lead him into excesses of rebellion. The revelation of God is that only in his will is our peace; and every last one of the untold millions of human wills must be brought by some sort of persuasion to acceptance of this law of our being. Yet the concept of sin is a very old one; the literature of Babylonia, for two thousand years before Israel's rise, is replete with expressions of the sense of human guilt. But these never at their best approach the height and depth of Hebrew penitence. And the reason is obvious; the Old Testament surpasses them in the measure that the Hebrew vision of God transcended that of all the ancient East. There is the meaning of sin; it is directed toward a holy God. The great Penitential confesses, "Against thee, only have I sinned". As Israel through the chastening of her history rose to ever higher knowledge of God, equally, and as a consequence, her sense of sin deepened. In the vast gulf that separates frail man from the transcendent holiness of a God of righteousness lies the poignancy of human sin. In the light of his pure countenance, "all our righteousnesses are but as filthy rags".

No other people has been so conscious of man's shortcoming as was Israel; yet none has held so exalted a concept of his essential nature. There are two other passages, intrinsically of Hebraic thought, which Niebuhr has neglected. Psalm 8 questions, it will be recalled, "What is man that thou rememberest him?" And the answer is "Thou hast made him a little lower than—", the King James version says "the angels". But the word is *'elohim'*, the normal and regular word for God. Man is made in the image of God, and but little lower than He! Is this the sin of pride, of rejecting creatureliness? If so, Niebuhr must indict the Biblical thinkers as well as his contemporaries. Even more important for our purpose is the great dissertation in Proverbs 8. It tells of some mysterious figure called "wisdom" who stands in the busiest places, wherever men congregate, calling to them: Turn in here; I'll show you the way to life's highest and enduring values. Then suddenly and without explanation we are in cosmic environment, "before the earth was . . . when he gave to the sea its bound that the waters should not transgress his command"; there was "wisdom" whom God "possessed before the beginning of his way"; it was beside him, it took delight in his work, and in particular came to find pleasure in mankind. The poetic imagery is lucid. The writer here tells, there can be no doubt, his conviction that a certain divine quality, manifest in the creative works of God, is immanent in man, *qua* man. It is this mysterious entity that goes with him as close and personal as his conscience, guiding, reproving, ever calling, Turn from the selfish and base and low; choose the hard upward path; on it alone you will find life's rewards.

Man is like God; he is little lower than He; but still more his essential nature is an incarnation of the divine. The matter draws farther and farther away from Niebuhr's Flaubertian diatribe against human pride. There is nothing here of the sinfulness of rejecting creatureliness; instead man in his essential nature possess something of the creator. Modern theologies based on the lost condition of man "apart from God" find here no comfort or support. For Biblical thought, a being of that sort does not exist and never has existed. God and man are intermingled in a way which only St. Paul's alleged quotation can adequately describe, "In him we live and move and have our being."

Man possesses, by virtue of his being human, a deep-based impulse intrinsically of the nature of God himself, which, though often thwarted, yet insistently calls him to aspire to higher things. Only in

obeying this voice of his deepest being does he find life's satisfactions. This strange stirring within him has on at least one occasion in his long history been the means and occasion of a great stride forward in progress, and what yet may be, we can estimate only from this astonishing character of man's being. Now what is this in modern terms? Observe I am not seeking to impose my prejudices on Biblical thought, but only to expound it as objectively and accurately as I can. Here is precisely the faith in progress that many of our contemporaries reject; here is the optimistic attitude to human life, convincing by virtue of its frank and full acceptance of the reality of tragedy; here is belief in the goodness and possibilities of man, as man, so consistent with what we have elsewhere that one may with some proper reserve claim that it is *the* Biblical view. And suddenly the truth dawns upon us: this is liberalism! There are those who will scoff. In the shift of fashion which is every whit as observable in theological thinking as in the styles of women's hats, liberalism is passé; one confesses himself just a bit naive if he will not throw at least one stone at it. Very good; the thought of Proverbs 8 has seen the rise and fall of many a fad, while it still stands a profound and commanding interpretation of the mystery of man.

Niebuhr's views on history can be dealt with more briefly, in part because we have already said some of the things that are necessary. One may be grateful to him that he has clarified a few points left uncertain in his *Faith and History.* His thought has expanded somewhat. He now says that Chinese and Indian theories of history were cyclical; but unfortunately it is a remark carrying not too much reassurance, for apparently he has taken it over uncritically from Baillie, who likewise was there outside his proper competence. He seems also to be influenced by Cullman in his emphasis on the revolution realized in New Testament thought; to that time Israel's theory had been linear, but the Gospel represents the arrival of the new age. Unfortunately once again the borrowing is less than convincing, for Cullman's idea takes inadequate account of Old Testament parallels to "realized eschatology". Actually there is no such difference as this theory postulates. Both Testaments have their theological realizations and hopes, which are in essence identical.

But his newer exposition serves to raise a fresh problem. For him, the "structure" of history has not changed since the coming of Christ. "If there is meaning (in history) it is beyond observation, and we must live by faith and hope." But how then does he differ from Karl Löwith whom he reviewed critically for not taking account of human movements for social betterment. For both of them, history is a sort of parade ground, where ever new recruit goes through identically the same maneuvers and return at night to precisely the same barracks. Like Löwith, too, he seems now to have swung over to a crass individualistic understanding of Christianity — "history has caught up with man", for this reason "the preaching of the Christian Gospel is to individual souls and not to nations". This is continental theology in its purity, notwithstanding his protestations of his American conditioning. If Niebuhr really means this, then he declares himself the enemy of the distinctive contribution of American church history, its concern for the social implications of the Gospel.

It is not clear whether he regards the Old Testament linear theory of history as mistaken or whether he considers it was true until the time of Christ, when a "new dispensation" came in. But to come to the core of the matter; his static theory rests, in so far as he expounded it adequately,

on two considerations; first, the course of events (apparently the world wars and the total insecurity of recent times) "has refuted man's theory of history"; and second, history "has merely written its evils larger and larger."

Let us see. The first consideration declares, for all who can understand, a complete lack of historic perspective. There is nothing unusual in the course of disasters and evils of the past fifty years. Periods such as this have occurred again and again. Isaiah and Jeremiah lived through even worse times; but, of a tougher mind than Dr. Niebuhr, they refused to abandon their conviction that God was working out good and glorious designs which would presently be manifest in an age of righteousness. The second observation is entirely true, if we omit the adverb; for we must note that history has also written its blessings larger and larger — and this remark is as irrelevant as the other! Along this line we get nowhere.

Niebuhr says that meaning in history is beyond our observation. Perhaps. It depends on how much history. Certainly it is difficult, if not impossible, to detect significant trends in a hundred years, perhaps in five hundred. But set in the larger scope, events commonly take on relevance. Does Niebuhr deny, for example, as Löwith does, that nothing of significance has happened since Alaric? Or put it in the longest perspective; is modern society no better than that of Pithecanthropus? I cannot believe he will entail the fully deserved scorn that would attach to an affirmative answer. But if we have progressed since man first emerged from his brute ancestry, then when and where? What ground is there for relegating it to distant ages? And if Niebuhr wishes I'll continue the interrogation: is there no progress (waiving discussion of all the immense questions inherent in the use of this word, for I believe that we would fully agree on what we look for in human advance) — is there no progress since Sumerian society, since the Pyramid age, since the Assyrians terrified all the civilized world, since the conditions against which Amos inveighed, since Greece and Rome (admitting to the full the greatness of their achievements), since the "medievalism" of the "dark ages?" Has modern science, granted fully its trivialities and errors, not opened the way for "progress" far beyond the past, some of which is already realized?

In his pronouncements on the problem of history, Niebuhr is merely voicing a pervasive mood of the present — and having thus impersonalized it perhaps I can criticize it freely without offense. It is a very shallow mood, and a very ill-informed one. I have failed to find a single one of these pessimists whose knowledge of history is of the comprehensiveness and depth to qualify him to give an opinion. Much more is demanded than a few outline facts about certain periods. Only the man who has gotten down to seemingly insignificant details of social life in remote ages as well as in recent ones is in a position to say whether or not history manifests meaning. Further it is self-imposed obscurantism to deny the possibility of an empirical approach to the problem. History is a phenomenon, and can yield results only by the methods fruitful in other investigations, that is by the accumulation of relevant facts and sane induction from them.

Yet it is scarcely fair to confine my comments to criticism. Mere sporting honesty demands that I lay myself open for a counter charge. So here is my view. History is comparable to a great stream; it has flowed out of the remote and obscure past; it has followed the line of least resistance twisting and turning in many loops and bends; it has run out in backwaters that have become stale and stagnant; here and there its streams have

flowed into the desert and been lost; not uncommonly it has looped backward on its course, losing long distances of its seeming objective. Yet in large and overall perspective all these deviations have been minor incidents; the stream flows steadily toward the sea. Then to drop the figure, the direction of history is toward what may be described in none too accurate terms as the values of the human spirit. What the future will be no one dare calculate, save only that the well established character of history, that is, of man, would seem to indicate that we shall find more and more of the same sort of thing. The "dark ages" are an ever-present menace that at any time may become a reality; human freedom entails a seemingly insoluble problem in unified movement toward an agreed goal. Yet the observable movement of the long course toward human values appears to indicate that this will still be its most significant character. The "wisdom of God" takes its place as a demonstrated reality of human history; we have ground to believe that it will ensure a future of growing brightness.

NEW FACULTY FOR 1952-53

Edward C. Hobbs, to teach New Testament, coming from The University of Chicago.

Joseph Mathews, who is to teach Christian Ethics, from Colgate University.

Bishop Paul Kern, Visiting Professor of Homiletics for the Winter Quarter.

Dr. Charles Thrift, Vice-President of Florida Southern, is to teach Church History during the Fall Quarter.

A more complete statement about new faculty members will appear in the Fall Number of the *Journal.*

THE EDITOR

ALUMNI NOTES

JAMES T. CARLYON, *Editor*

1921

William C. Martin was one of four men to receive the first "Distinguished Alumni Award" at the Dallas Corral, March 24, 1952. The citation included his graduation from Hendrix College, his service with the Medical Corps in World War I, his representation of the Methodist Church at the Amsterdam Conference of the World Council of Churches in 1948, and his illustrious ministry as pastor and as Bishop. He presides over the Dallas area.

1922

The Christian Advocate carried the picture of *Ira A. Brumley,* and described his duties as Executive Secretary of the Board of Education of the North Arkansas Conference. At Blytheville, Ark., he was leader of a Training School for Christian Workers, early in 1952. His faculty was composed of himself and three other alumni of Perkins: Alfred Eason, 1943; Roy Bagley, 1944; and Newton Lee Cates, 1946.

1924

Z. R. Fee, a member of the Central Texas Conference, residing at 4217 University Blvd., Dallas, is the author of two new books: *The Christian's Philosophy of Religion,* and *Home Sweet Home — Here and Hereafter.* They are both published by The Wilkinson Publishing Co., of Dallas, and sell for $2.00 and $1.50 respectively. The Cokesbury, the Baptist, and the Presbyterian Book stores of Dallas carry both books for sale.

Gaston Foote has recently been transferred from Dayton, Ohio, to First Church, Fort Worth. He led in one of the Thursday Lenten services being conducted at University Park Methodist Church in 1952. *Warren Johnston,* who has had a great ministry at First Church, is now at First Methodist in Baton Rouge, La.

Kenneth Pope of First Church in Houston, second largest church in Methodism, has led his people in an ambitious program of improvement of the church equipment. He will be commencement speaker at Lon Morris Junior College, May 26, 1952.

1925

Henry Bowden, District Superintendent of the Shreveport District of the Louisiana Conference, was made Vice-president of the Perkins School of Theology Alumni Association. The meeting was held during Ministers' Week in February, in Dallas.

1926

Hubert C. Smith is rejoicing at the lovely new Church equipment recently completed at First Methodist in Waxahachie, Texas, Central Texas Conference. During the Spring months he led in the presentation of four Forum programs at the church, under the general subject, "The Church in Modern Life".

1928

Neill Hart, of First Church, El Dorado, Arkansas, is the author of a book *The Church and the Home Work Together.* It will be used as a text in Training Schools for Church Workers. First Church is now the second largest church of the Little Rock Conference. Mrs. Hart is Director of Children's Work of the South Central Jurisdiction of the Methodist Church.

1930

George Bowles is happy in his work as Chaplain of a great hospital, Barnes Hospital of St. Louis, Mo. Of more than 350 hospital chaplains in the U.S., only 81 are fully trained men. George is one of 5 fully accredited chaplains of the Methodist Church. As a part of his duties at the hospital he assists in the clinical training of young Lutheran ministers, who serve as orderlies in the hospital.

John Donaho and *Mrs. Donaho* are finding the busy program at First Church, Corpus Christi, Texas, enough to take all their time and strength. They served,

recently, as hosts to the Group Meeting of the WSCS of the Southwest Texas Conference. John spoke at the Flinn luncheon, February 6, 1952.

Cecil Peeples and his hospitable wife are greatly enjoying the new *President's Home* at Lon Morris College in Jacksonville, Texas. The editor had a pleasant afternoon with the young preacher boys in the lovely living room, during a recent visit to East Texas. Mrs. Peeples is proud of the wonderful kitchen appliances which include an electric washer and an electric ironer. The value of the House is estimated at $50,000.

Ben Sturdivant has prepared a most attractive folder announcing the completion of the edifice at Crown Heights Methodist Church in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The location is 1021 Northwest 37th Street, where the congregation moved in 1935. Women's Parlor, the Activities and Education Building, and the exquisite sanctuary make an almost perfect appointment for religious services. He writes, "The lofted ceilings and the beautiful altar make the sanctuary an inspiring place for worship and meditation."

1931

Marvin L. Boyd gave the main address at the meeting of the Northwest Texas Board of Education, January 24-25, 1952. The theme for the session was "The Gospel and Its Implications for Our Day." It was held at Lubbock. The closing meditation address was given by Jordan Grooms (1938).

1932

Eugene Slater of Polk Street, Amarillo, Texas, was preacher in the Methodist Series of the Protestant Hour, March 23, 1952. He was heard at 7:30 a.m. over radio stations of the National Broadcasting Company. The sermon subject was, "Give God a Chance."

1933

Cyrus Barcus of First Church in Taylor, Texas, has inspired the project of sending to our missions in Brazil, South America, a fully equipped "Travelling Church". The churches of the District joined in raising the necessary funds which amounted to $5,000. Equipment includes "a public address system, loud speakers, sound films, records, a library, and a gasoline motor by which electricity can be generated." A like motor church was sent in 1950 by the same Georgetown District of the Central Texas Conference.

1934

Henry Mood and the officials of First Church, Garland, turned the first dirt on January 20th for the Education Building which will greatly add to the facilities of this strategically situated church. They estimate the first unit will cost $150,000. Two other units are contemplated. Garland is booming.

1935

Chess Lovern of Laurel Heights, San Antonio, Texas, was elected by his fellow alumni to be president of Perkins Alumni Association. The meeting was held during Ministers' Week, in Dallas.

1938

J. Morris Bailey reports that, with the assistance of Prof. John H. Hicks, his charge led the Cisco District in number of commitments during the week of the All Texas Revival. He announces an Open House in his new $25,000 parsonage on March 23rd and its consecration April 20, 1952.

1939

Billy Bray is engaged in language study at Berkeley, the University of California, preparatory to taking up his work as teacher of New Testament at Nisha Nomiya, Kwansie Gakuin, Japan. Billy won the Selecman award in New Testament Greek while at S.M.U. He won the Noyes-Cutter prize in Koine Greek, at the University of Chicago. Another alumnus of S.M.U., Tadeo Aiura, is Prof. of Old Testament in the same school.

H. Thornton Fowler became pastor of historic old McKendree Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., January 27, 1952. Since 1945 he has been the minister at Cookeville, Tenn. There he came to a place of recognized leadership in his conference. He is delegate to his Jurisdictional Conference.

1940

Durwood Fleming reports a membership of 1,350, as the congregation occupies the first unit of its new (and only) church edifice. They have an operating budget of

$70,000. The first unit cost some $1,000,000. Durwood writes that they have set a regular goal of paying $1 of every $3, for service to others.

1941

W. M. Greenwaldt, associate pastor at Herring Avenue Methodist Church in Waco, Texas, served as Dean of the city wide training school, February 10-14, 1952.

J. Gordon Patterson, pastor of Wesley church in Shawnee, Oklahoma, reports a booming city, due to industrial activity. His people have recently spent $2,000 in decorating and furnishing the parsonage. He has an educational assistant. His two boys are Jimmy, aged 5, and Harold, aged 17 months.

1942

Shrum Burton, pastor of Melrose Church, Kansas City, Mo., has been released from his duties there that he may return to the chaplaincy. He is stationed at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. He is to be succeeded by Charles A. McEowen (1946), formerly Minister of Education in Central Church in the same city.

Ed M. Mathison has become pastor of Riverside Methodist Church in Houston, Texas, succeeding Mr. Lehmberg, who was called to First Methodist Church in Colorado Springs, Colo.

1946

Ferris Baker, Wesley Foundation director at Denton, Texas, represented the workers with students in the various schools of Texas, at the testimonial dinner for Dr. Flinn, who was retiring from general direction of the work in Texas. A large company of friends, on February 6th, gathered in appreciation of the 14 years of devoted service given by Dr. Flinn.

Dick and *Mary Bush* of Manila, Philippines, announce the birth of Nancy (now nearly a year old). In addition to his work as minister of the English church, Dick is Chaplain at the University, teaches two courses at the Union Seminary, makes numberless addresses, etc. Mary is taking on regular teaching at Philippine Christian College. Dick writes, "We are looking forward in the very near future to the construction of a student center, residence, and chapel at the university site."

William H. Dickinson and wife, of Highland Park Methodist Church in Dallas, Texas, went to Alaska for the week of the Evangelistic Mission. They anticipate the forming of a church at Fairbanks, the minister to be sent by The Board of Missions.

John Wesley Hardt served as Religious Emphasis preacher at Lon Morris College, Jacksonville, Texas, Jan. 28-Feb. 1. He is a Phi Theta graduate of the school. His wife took the Founders' award when a student at the school.

N. H. Kupferle is the regular teacher of a great Bible Class for men at Austin Avenue Methodist Church at Waco, Texas. He is associate pastor and directs much of the educational work.

1947

C. Herman Murph delights to call Asbury Church in San Antonio, Texas, the "Church of the Friendly Heart". Starting with one family 3 years ago, the number has now risen to 350. A Fellowship Hall, costing $35,000 will serve as sanctuary until the new church can be erected.

1949

Sam Jones, Sixth Street Church, Longview, Texas, reports over 100 new members for the Conference year, and others coming. Property has been purchased which will make possible a fine development of the program in the years ahead.

1950

Mr. and Mrs. John Walter Cason were among the 77 missionaries who sailed for Africa, Feb. 25, 1952. He is a grandson of Rev. J. Walter Mills, a stalwart leader in the Texas Conference for many years. Mrs. Cason graduated with John from both Rice and S.M.U.

Herbert N. Conley has recently been moved to La Mesa, New Mexico, where he followed Carl Lawson (1947). Carl left a splendid church plant. Herbert has added air conditioning and a Hammond organ. He reports real progress in cultivating the worship spirit in the congregation. He says of the altar centered sanctuary, "Having watched the change that has come over the people, surely this has a place in Methodism." He recommends a larger place for training in worship in the Perkins curriculum.

BOOK REVIEWS

Fred D. Gealy, *Editor*

The Interpreter's Bible
Volume VIII

Edited by Nolan B. Harmon, George A. Buttrick, Walter Russell Bowie, Paul Scherer, John Knox, and Samuel Terrien. New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952. ix + 811 pp. $8.75.

This second volume of *The Interpreter's Bible* has arrived on schedule. The next to appear will be Volume 1, which will be released in September to synchronize with the publication of the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament.

The non-denominational character of this project may be seen by a glance at the names on the Editorial Board and the list of Consulting Editors and Contributors. A work of this nature, sponsored by a denominational agency yet free from denominational interest and emphasis, must rejoice ecumenical-minded Christians everywhere; for here the universal church is given precedence, and a blow is struck at denominational self-satisfaction and self-sufficiency.

The present volume deals with Luke and John. The introduction to, and exegesis of, Luke are written by S. MacLean Gilmour, Professor of New Testament Literature and Criticism, Queen's Theological College. Both tasks are admirably done. In the former are given the conclusions of careful scholarship concerning introductory and background problems. Where data is lacking for a justifiable conclusion he does not hesitate to give his own views, as, for instance, when he suggests that the two-volume work was written for the church at Rome, takes his stand against the traditional view of authorship, and rejects outright the proto-Luke hypothesis. His history of the tradition in Luke's gospel is short but adequate, his treatment of form-criticism fair and convincing. The exegetical notes are illuminated by the latest and best work in the field of textual criticism and by reference to pertinent literature.

The exposition of Luke is done by Walter Russell Bowie, John Knox, George A. Buttrick, and Paul Scherer, each taking six chapters, and in that order. The mere mention of these names is exciting to the Biblical student. The fact that three of these expositors have for a number of years been leading preachers and interpreters of the Word in the English-speaking world, and the other (Knox) is a New Testament scholar known for his competence and warm devotion leads the student to high expectations; and he is not disappointed. The reader detects no seams or joints as he moves from the work of one expositor to the other. There is a freshness in the exposition which in some cases can be measured; as, for instance when Buttrick's interpretation of the parable of the Prodigal Son is compared with his treatment of the same story in his *The Parables of Jesus*, written nearly 25 years ago. We wondered then how anything new could ever be written about this immortal story; but something new has been added. A fidelity to the historical Jesus is manifest throughout the exposition. All the writers hold, in a very significant sense, to the finality of Jesus. "Jesus is final in that the grace of God which came in him can never be transcended. But the real *finality* of that which the Gospel of Luke thinks of as having been once and for all accomplished is the gift in him of a life which has infinite *fertility*" (Bowie, page 27).

The introductory and exegetical work on John is done by Wilbert F. Howard, Principal of Handsworth College, Birmingham, England, a Johannine scholar of first rank.

Howard is a linguist as well as an exegete, no doubt a better exegete because he is a linguist. In the introduction he brings the reader up to date on critical questions; he calls attention to and explains the many peculiarities of the writing. His section on the keywords and theological conceptions of the gospel is exceptionally helpful. The author, he holds, was a sacramental mystic, "a theologian who looked at history *sub specie aeternitatis,* a preacher who selected incidents in the life of Jesus to illustrate the truths which the Son of God came to reveal, and cited words of Jesus in order to expand and interpret them after the manner of the Jewish Targums of the Old Testament." One of the peculiar features of this gospel, as every student of the book knows, is the author's treatment of miracle. Howard holds, correctly, that all the miracles are recorded for their symbolic suggestiveness, and recorded in such a way as to remind us that the writer is a dramatist who handles the tradition with theological rather than with historical intent.

The exposition of John is written by Arthur John Gossip, Emeritus Professor of Christian Ethics and Practical Training, University of Glasgow, and preacher of international repute, perhaps known best to Americans for his books of sermons which stress the need and resources for valiant living. Possessed of a strong Christian imagination he sees in what others regard as "mere historical notes" a wealth of spiritual suggestiveness (see his comments on John 2:12). While his exposition is philosophical and theological, it is at the same time extremely practical. His thoughts on the problem of suffering are all the more helpful because they spring from his own experience (see comments on John 9:1-3). Not only does the preacher find here a flowing spring of preaching material; better still, he is often brought face to face with himself, and confronted with the necessity of examining his own attitudes and motives. One could hardly find a better example of spiritual therapy than the exposition of John 3:22-30. Here is the picture of a man — it happens to be John the Baptist in this instance — who is surpassed and superseded and yet can "take his own eclipse without a trace of rancour or jealousy." The practical conclusions are painfully pointed: "How are we to gain something of the Baptist's largeness of mind and soul? By the reflex action of intercessory prayer, says William Law, asserting positively that it is impossible to harbor animosity or jealousy toward one for whom we keep interceding before God. If, he declares with the assurance of experience, someone is leaving you behind, and you are becoming jealous and embittered, keep praying that he may have success in the very matter where he is awakening your envy; and whether he is helped or not, one thing is sure, that your own soul will be cleansed and ennobled, that you will grow a little nearer to the stature of the Baptist."

This volume deepens the impression of the practical intent of the series. Meticulous scholarship in this field, when incorporated in commentaries, often has the effect of frightening people away from the Bible, creating as it does the impression that it is a book for specialists, far above the reach of the average man. This, of course, is extremely unfortunate; for the Bible yields its value only as it is understood and its truths are set to life. All meaningful study of the Bible must therefore point to and find its true justification in interpretation. Any study that calls attention to itself or becomes an end in itself, thus obscuring the final and total aim, is fruitless scholarship. This general truth is recognized by the sponsors of this work and is exhibited in its pages. The conclusions of the ripest scholarship, unencumbered by needless details, are found in the exegetical notes. On this foundation the expositors build. Thus men with a passion for truth and men with a passion for its practical application (and the two are one!) labor together "to interpret anew the timeless truth of God's Holy Word." Volume VIII of *The Interpreter's Bible* is convincing evidence that they have again succeeded.

WESLEY C. DAVIS

THE STRUCTURE OF THE DIVINE SOCIETY

By F. W. Dillistone. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951. 263 pp. $4.00.

It has frequently been said that many

Protestants, and Methodists in particular, have no doctrine of the Church. It has also been pointed out that Evangelical Protestantism does not hold the Church in high regard. Both of these accusations have considerable truth in them. Mr. Dillistone's book can do much to provide help on the formation of one's own doctrine of the Church. It is hardly conceivable that a churchman can read this book without a greater appreciation of the "Divine Society." Although the book is not for casual reading, it is clearly written and shows keen insight into the nature both of the Church, the Divine Society, and of the larger society of which the Church is a part.

There are, writes Mr. Dillistone, six major theories of the Church: the monastic, the imperial, the organic, the covenantal, the contractual, and the sectarian. It is in the organic and the covenantal that he finds the greatest hope for a doctrine of the Church. Both theories find support in the Scriptures, and in the history of the Church. Mr. Dillistone's conclusion is that the two must be held in balance for an adequate view of the Church and society alike.

How is the Church an organism? It is a divine society possessing a life of its own, having been called into being by the action of the Holy Spirit. That is, the Church is more than a collection of individuals who come together because of a common loyalty (or covenant). It is the Body of Christ, and a body of any sort must have a nature of its own greater than the sum of its parts. It is, if you will, the mystical Body of Christ, into which in a sense individuals are *grafted*. But, warns Mr. Dillistone, if you take this principle too far either with regard to society or the Church, you end with totalitarianism. If the Church is a complete organic unity or if society is an organism in the strict sense, then no member individually may be allowed deviation from the organism, and if such deviation occurs, the member must be cut out, as infected members of the body are amputated. Roman and Anglo-Catholicism, and Naziism and Russian Communism represent the furthest extension of the organismic principle.

But what of the other extreme? Protestantism has more often tended to say that the Church has no life apart from the voluntary association of members who have covenanted with God and with each other through Christ, and have formed a sort of loose confederation as a result of their covenant. Although the *covenant* principle has been implicit in most Protestant doctrines of the Church, often the *contractual* principle has been followed, and little sense of organic unity has resulted. A person is still just an individual who happens to become a part of a congregation.

It is difficult, as one tries to describe the organic and the covenant theories, not to speak of the two in relationship. Hence Mr. Dillistone's conclusion that the two must be held in balance seems like a sound one. It is, he points out, in the family, where organic and the covenant principles both find the best relationship. "The organic principle is represented by the biological character of the family-unit." But the covenant principle is also present in the family, as the different personalities "encounter one another, sometimes in tension, sometimes in deepening fellowship." Thus there is no automatic unity just because of biological relationships: the members of the organic unit must work out their relationship or the unity is broken.

Now, continues Mr. Dillistone, this is the ideal for which we ought to aim in the larger society. It is the problem of freedom and order, individualism and social control, free enterprise and social planning. Both in society and in the Church there is a danger that these two principles will not be held in the proper balance. Either one or the other may be lost. This must not be allowed to happen, even though we may not agree which principle should be foremost. Perhaps the best summary statement is one quoted from T. W. Manson: ". . . the Church is the Body of Christ, a living, growing organism, born when He was born; and . . . the Church is the community of the redeemed, whose redemption is purchased by the death of Christ and appropriated by the faith of the believer."

There are tremendous implications in the book. For Methodists, the tendency has probably been more in the direction of the contractual rather than the organic. At

times, Mr. Dillistone seems to be tempted in the opposite direction, though he is much opposed to the trend of Anglo-Catholicism within his own Communion. Perhaps he does not make the "fellowship principle" a sufficiently integral part of his doctrine of the Church, although it might be argued that this is not so much a part of the nature of the Church as it is a result of being a part of the covenantal-organic relationship. Although Mr. Dillistone appears not to appreciate the function of the sect, he does make room for the "sect - within - the - Church" when he points out that those who have covenanted together may at times so deny the validity of the covenant that some group or some person has to step out and revitalize the covenantal relationship.

Mr. Dillistone's practical considerations concerning the development of Church union will be rejected by many. He does not, for example, feel that the World Council of Churches is likely at present to effect the unity which has been brought about in several areas of the world on a *regional* basis.

But however this may be, *The Structure of Divine Society* is an important book. Mr. Dillistone has worked through carefully, sincerely, and with great understanding the problem to which he set himself. The results are those of a mature mind.

HOWARD GRIMES

GOSPEL AND LAW

By C. H. Dodd. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. 83 pp. $1.50.

In *Gospel and Law,* four lectures delivered at Columbia University, Professor Dodd treats the subject of the relation of faith and ethics in early Christianity. The subject is particularly timely in a period noted for the persistent effort of philosophisal ethics to establish itself in autonomy apart from religion. It is Dodd's contention that Christianity recognizes no ultimate separation between the service of God and social behavior. All moral obligation flows from the eternal nature of God as revealed in Christ. This essential character of Christianity has come to distinctive expression in both gospels and epistles in a duality of structure described as *kerygma* (proclamation) and *didaché* (teaching). Missionary procedure was first to confront men with "the good news" of what God had done in the life and work of Jesus Christ, His conflicts, suffering, and death, and His resurrection from the dead, and of judgment to come. Those who responded and became members of the church were then instructed in morals, the *didaché.* This moral instruction was generally of practical import. Certain easily condoned pagan vices were condemned; virtues such as purity and sobriety, generosity and hospitality, readiness to forgive, were urged; the Christian attitude in relations of members of the family, of masters and slaves, of church members, emphasized; Christians should obey the laws of the state, pay taxes, and be non-provocative of those outside the church; finally, they must be loyal in face of persecution.

In this moral teaching there is, of course, nothing peculiarly Christian. Distinctively Christian motives or sanctions appear at four points. 1. *Christian Eschatology.* Christians believed they were living in a unique period of history. Life had acquired a fresh dimension. Under the sense of impending catastrophe everything in this world seemed temporary and provisional. This sense of transience provided a motive for moral earnestness and a sober sense of responsibility.

2. *The Body of Christ.* The idea of the church as an organism, a body only because it is Christ's body, depends upon Him and serves His ends, means a shift in the idea of social obligation. "The New Testament gives no encouragement to the idea that the individual is self-determining, or is an end in himself. . . . He is a 'member' of the body." Yet the Christian does not live for the body, but for Him whose body it is. "Rightly understood, therefore, the church is the one society which can make total demands upon its members without being totalitarian, because it is not, and never dreams to be, a self-determining sovereign power. It is entirely subordinate to ends beyond itself, the ends of Christ."

3. *The Imitation of Christ.* As one with Christ, Christians are to find in Him an objective standard of ethical conduct. Imi-

tation of Christ is imitation of God Himself so far as God can be a model for His creatures.

4. *The Primacy of Love, or Charity.* The governing concept of Christian ethics, Christian love, is "that total attitude which is brought about by exposure to the love of God as it is expressed in Christ's self-sacrifice." At this point, the religious and ethical moments in Christianity are no longer distinguishable.

In the third and fourth lectures, Dodd draws the inferences from the prevalence of *didaché* in both epistles and gospels that the term "Law of Christ" is valid — and this over against the Reformation churches and some neo-Protestant emphases. The precepts of Jesus are not mere broad generalities. Dodd's fine suggestion here is that Jesus' precepts indicate " the *quality* and *direction* of action which shall conform to the standard set by the divine *agapé*."

The treatment of specific texts is always interesting and religiously meaningful. The format of the book is of as good quality as its contents. FRED D. GEALY

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

By Richard Heard. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. xii + 268 pps. $3.00.

The Cambridge University lecturer in Divinity has written a most interesting and useful introduction to the study of New Testament literature and religion. After twenty-five pages devoted to "The New Testament as a Whole," concerned with a brief history of criticism, of the history of the canon and the present state of text criticism, the New Testament writings are grouped and treated with reference to four "great religious issues," namely, the historical value of the gospels, the historical value and interpretation of the Acts, the value of the epistles for reconstructing the apostolic teaching, and the place of the apocalyptic expectation in the New Testament. The treatment is up-to-date, using the categories "Kerygma" and "Didaché," made current coin by Dodd. Form-criticism is used cautiously but appreciatively. Heard is still inclined to a basic two-document theory for the Synoptics, modifying it in the case of Matthew by supposing an additional two extensive written sources, the "Testimonies," and a second collection of Jesus' sayings overlapping Q and from which at least the Sermon on the Mount was derived. He shies away from Streeter's Proto-Luke idea, preferring oral tradition as source of Luke's special material. The Gospel of John, essentially a unity, he thinks was written by a member of the Christian community in Palestine where the apostle John was well known, and perhapes based on "some document written by John or inspired by him."

As to the Epistles, probably James at least reproduces the teachings of the Lord's brother. The Petrine authorship of I Peter may be defended if it be supposed Peter wrote through a Greek-speaking companion such as Silas. II Peter cannot be genuine. Of the Paulines, only Ephesians and the Pastorals are regarded as pseudo-Pauline, and the Pastorals are held to contain genuine fragments. There is no reason to doubt that Jude was written by a brother of Jesus.

As regards apocalyptic, "It cannot be contested that the primitive church as a whole, and even the apostles, held firmly to a mistaken view of the nearness of the end." However, Heard inclines to believe that Jesus himself did not teach his early return in glory with accompanying judgment but that his teaching was "from the earliest days misinterpreted and transformed."

There is not space further to recount opinions stated in the book, but it is hoped that the above items are sufficient to show what a fresh and frank statement of the New Testament Mr. Heard has written. The book deserves to be widely read and enjoyed. FRED D. GEALY

THE WORK AND WORDS OF JESUS

By Archibald M. Hunter. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951. 196 pp. $2.50.

Interpreting the New Testament, 1900-1950

By Archibald M. Hunter. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1952. 144 pp. $2.50.

Thoroughly acquainted with contemporary literature on the New Testament, Professor Hunter of Aberdeen University, although nowhere dogmatic, clings to the conservative side. The Virgin Birth he regards as congruous with the whole picture of Christ in the New Testament and therefore as probably fact. Yet he insists that in the case of any miracle "it is a matter of historical evidence." And good evidence must be early and from a competent witness. For example, the feeding of the multitude, appearing in four gospels is better attested than the turning of water into wine, appearing only in John. Some miracle narratives may be legitimately rationalized, he thinks. Yet such procedure is distasteful to him: he prefers to say that once Jesus is believed to be the Incarnate Son of God, "the main objection to the other miracles falls to the ground." Of course the real problem is that since in the nature of the case "historical evidence" in the strict sense of the word is never adequate to prove any specific "miracle," in just what miracles does a theological presupposition compel or warrant faith, even letting God be God?

The same rather ambivalent attitude is revealed in Hunter's remarks on the resurrection of Jesus. The empty tomb he accepts as fact. Yet he does not believe that the Resurrection body of Jesus was his actual physical body. A physical body would have to be translated to the sky. And such a view (as in Acts 1:9) "is not acceptable to the modern man." Therefore he thinks it wiser to believe that "the physical body of our Lord was, in some way we cannot understand, *transformed* into a spiritual body, a body which is no impediment to the spirit."

One further example of Hunter's approach may be taken from the chapter on Jesus' teaching about the future. It is certain that Jesus predicted disaster for the Jewish temple and people and foresaw the fatal clash with Rome. Yet he did not expect some sort of Paradise on earth to follow these calamities. He never spoke of his *Parousia* or of his coming "again." His predictions were fulfilled in the events of Easter Day, of Pentecost and in the victorious expansion of the church.

The better of the two books in our judgment is the second, the survey of New Testament criticism in the last fifty years. This is a most useful book, listing the important books of the last half century and indicating trends in interpretation, and contemporary conclusions as far as they are available. It is to be most enthusiastically recommended to ministers and laymen who do not have time to read commentaries or serious studies on detailed aspects of the New Testament literature. Indeed, the book would be a good orientation for theological students to the subject of New Testament study.

Fred D. Gealy

The One Church In the Light of the New Testament

By Clarence Tucker Craig. New York, Nashville and Dallas: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951. 155 pp. $2.00.

Delivered as lectures in 1950 in the notable series established at Southwestern University, Georgetown, *The One Church* is a most timely statement on the problems of a united church. Dean Craig's wide experience in ecumenical gatherings, his able participation in and continual furtherance of the growing movement towards a world church added to his intimate and comprehensive knowledge of the New Testament and the early church equip him in an extraordinary way for writing this book.

The problems of the form of church organization, of the various types of ministry, the ordering of the Lord's Supper, baptism and church membership, problems of doctrine and creed, are all treated clearly, frankly, and with utmost generosity and goodwill. Fresh insights appear on every page. One could wish that the book be as widely read by Anglicans and Baptists as by Methodists. What a fine study book for church training classes it would be!

Fred D. Gealy

John L. Lewis

By Saul Alinsky. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1949. 387 pp. $4.00.

Read this book and you will stifle any impulse you may have to boo when John L. Lewis next appears in the news reel. It is one of the most thrilling biographies this reviewer has read.

There are revelations here as to why Lewis formed the CIO, information about the birth of the sit-down strike, a discussion of how and why Lewis stalemated the U. S. Government and why he broke with Roosevelt.

One of the high spots in the book is the description of the titanic struggle between General Motors and the CIO. This struggle is too complicated to deal with in this brief review, but every minister would benefit by studying this conflict.

After the General Motors strike was finally won by the CIO, the brief struggle with Chrysler began. Alinsky's description of these meetings, as is true of much of the book, is high drama.

> "Throughout these negotiations Chrysler's Keller sat sneering across the table, disdainfully looking beyond Lewis and his cohorts with cold arrogance. His insulting stares infuriated the CIO leaders. Finally Lewis decided to break Keller . . . To Lewis and his associates Keller's face began to symbolize the attitudes and position of a giant corporation toward its employees.
>
> "The tension heightened, and suddenly Keller broke his silence. Turning to Lewis, with a sneer in his voice, he said, 'Mr. Lewis, you haven't said a word about this situation. Do you happen to have any comment or contribution?'
>
> "Lewis rose slowly to his feet and with a murderous stare at Keller softly replied, 'Yes, Mr. Keller, yes, I have. I am ninety-nine per cent of a mind to come around this table right now and with one fell swoop wipe that damn sneer off your face!'
>
> "There was dead silence in the room. Governor Murphy cleared his throat and announced a brief recess."

The next day Lewis demolished Keller. He carried on his denunciation in low, cold, withering words. He drove Keller and drove him until everyone thought Keller would have a stroke of apoplexy.

"Finally Keller leaped to his feet and screamed, 'Stop it, stop it, Mr. Lewis!' . . . and finally ended by shouting, 'Mr. Lewis, I want you to know, Mr. Lewis, I-I-I am not afraid of your eyebrows.'

"Lewis's laughter rolled Keller out of the fight, and Chrysler gave up."

Lewis's break with President Roosevelt contained the elements of surprise that are characteristic of many of his conferences. The President started the conversation by saying,

" 'John, I want your support.' Lewis replied, 'You mean, Mr. President, you want the CIO's support. What assurances can you give the CIO?'

"The President became irritated and snapped at Lewis, 'Well, what do you mean? Haven't I always been friendly to the CIO?'

" 'Well, Mr. President,' said Lewis, 'if you are a friend of labor, why is the FBI tapping all my phones, both at my home and at my office, and why do they have instructions to follow me about?'

"The President replied, 'That's not true.'

"Lewis said, 'I say it is true.'

"The President replied, 'That's a damn lie.'

"Lewis got up, looked down at the President and said, 'Nobody can call John L. Lewis a liar and least of all Franklin Delano Roosevelt!'

"Lewis started walking out of the room, and just as he reached the door the President said, 'Come back, John, I want to talk to you.' Lewis walked back in the room and said, 'My phones are tapped, and everything I said is true, and whatever I said I know I can prove by Frank Murphy, who told me and who knows about it because he has seen your orders to the FBI to do so.' "

The President changed the subject. They

engaged in small talk about minor things for about ten minutes, then Lewis walked out of the room. Roosevelt and Lewis were done.

THOMAS H. MARSH

The Puritan Heritage

By George M. Stephenson. New York: Macmillan, 1952. 282 pp. $3.50.

The author of this vigourously written volume has been for many years a professor of American history at the University of Wisconsin, and presumably the materials in this book have, through the years constituted a distinctive emphasis in his teaching. What he has done here is to put the influence of the Christian religion where it belongs in American history, quite in contrast to the mine-run of American historians who have almost completely left it out. And this is by far the best way to deal with spiritual forces in American history, not as something apart, but as an integral part of American life. To assume that American civilization can be understood without taking into consideration the things of the mind and the spirit is an absurdity, and yet that is just what a majority of present-day American history teachers are trying to do.

In this volume Professor Stephenson clearly sets forth those factors which have gone into the making of our distinctive American heritage. The chapter headings will indicate what he considers these forces to be: the New England Puritans, the Quakers, the Great Colonial Awakenings, the rise and development of American Methodism and its impact upon the frontier, Revivalism and the conditions out of which it arose, the Unitarian and other liberalizing movements. The many benevolent agencies which arose to meet the spiritual and educational needs of the west are treated accurately and succintly in separate chapters.

Dr. Stephenson does not bemoan the fact, as many others with less understanding have done, that America by the end of the Colonial period was dotted with "religious experiment stations." This was inevitable from the fact that the English colonies, unlike other European colonizers, opened wide their doors to all, with the result that there came out of American experience a wide tolerance of religious differences. It was the influences which flowed from this diversity which put into the Constitution of the United States its finest provision, the guarantee of religious freedom.

The last four chapters treat of the two principal challenges which faced America at the middle of the last century, the great European immigrant tides, especially those that flowed from Roman Catholic Europe and the tragic struggle over the slavery issue. The first challenged the Puritan heritage of religious freedom; the second was a challenge to the doctrine of basic human rights.

I do not know a better book to place in the hands of students of American history to enable them to round out the total picture of how America came to be.

WILLIAM. W. SWEET

A Faith That Fulfills

By Julius Seelye Bixler. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1951. 122 pp. $2.00.

The president of Colby College, Waterville, Maine, has done some careful and courageous thinking in this little book. The chapter on "A Faith That Falters" is by far the best critical study of Neo-Orthodoxy which has come to my attention. He writes fairly and with appreciation of the values in the movement. But his disposal of the point of view is devastating. Of the group he writes, "If the rational is as irrelevant to the religious life as they profess, one wonders why they bother to write books in which the appeal to reason is made. Of the source author back of Barth and Brunner, he has this to say, "Certainly Kierkgaard was an unusual man with virtues that deserve our respect. But we ought to be clear that consistency was not one of them. He professed to distrust words, yet in his short life he spent a large amount of time with words and succeeded in putting an extraordinary number of them on paper. . . . One ought, he said, to take part in the world's work — have regular employment, establish a home, raise a family, vote and fight for social bettermen. Yet he himself did none of these."

Over against this faith which has faltered, Dr. Bixler has set his own position. "Opposed to this is our view that faith and reason enter into a partnership that is harmonious since faith is active commitment to the Rational Good." Modern science deserves our admiration and must be seen to contribute to the better understanding of the universe. "We are on sure ground if we cling to the fact of this development from star dust to conscious life as one trend in this extraordinary world — not the only one, but the one which is to us far and away the most important. Of it we are a part."

Dr. Bixler advises that we listen to the voices which tell us of the critical situation in which we live. Yet their diagnoses seem better than their offered solutions. "Man is indeed in a predicament; but he can face it with dignity. Though he has failed at certain crucial points in his moral development he has not lost his own integrity. . . . The makings of a spiritual crusade are here. . . . Mind and heart can join in a faith that holds that God is first of all a God of truth and that what leads to truth must lead to God himself."

The book comprises the contents of the Ayer Lectures of 1948, the Garvin Lecture of 1950, and the Lyman Lecture of 1949.

JAMES T. CARLYON

CHRISTUS VICTOR

By Gustaf Aulen. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1951. 159 pp. $2.50.

This is an American edition of a book which has had a considerable vogue in England for the past few years. As the subtitle has it, the work is "a historical study of the three main types of the idea of the atonement." Dr. Aulen is one of the major theologians of the Swedish Luthern Church, holding the chair of systematic theology at the University of Lund.

The theories of Anselm and of Abelard are here discarded in favor of what may be called the "Classical View" of the atonement. Its central thesis is that man must be redeemed or ransomed from the powers of evil which hold him captive. Jesus Christ is in full meaning our only Saviour from these hostile powers. He represents the will and the love of God at work for our redemption. The work of the Atonement is directed not toward God but toward the Devil. We needed no defense against God.

The book is faithfully documented with abundant references to the New Testament. Dr. Aulen is sure that his view is the Biblical view.

The most interesting chapter to us who are not Lutherans is called "The Classic View of Luther." For those who follow the great Reformationist, it is enough to get his support for the establishing of a position. From a long quotation from Luther's *Longer Commentary on Galatians,* this sentence will show the teaching there given, "When therefore thou lookest upon this person thou seest sin, death, God's wrath, hell, the devil, all evil, overcome and dead. In so far therefore as Christ by his grace rules in the hearts of the faithful, there is found no more sin, death, and curse; but where Christ is not known they still remain." This seems to Dr. Aulen "an exposition of the whole essence of Lutheran theology."

The author does not seek to fix the language of the theory, nor does he wish to make the form given it by Luther a dogma. It needs to be restated in every age, but its marks are clear, that "the Atonement is, above all, a movement of God to man, not in the first place a movement from man to God. We shall hear again . . . the old realistic message of the conflict of God with the dark, hostile forces of evil . . . we shall . . . go to meet the evil with a battle song of

JAMES T. CARLYON

PRAYERS AND MEDITATIONS

By Gerald Heard. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949. 153 pp. $2.00.

These thirty-one devotional messages or meditations and prayers have been chosen with the intention of sending one to sleep in a mood that will make him ready for the tasks of the morrow. Here are some of the finest mystical writings of Christian saints and devoted thinkers. One of the best is from St. Anselm. Several are from the heart and mind of a modern liberal, Aldous Huxley. They were all used in a small fellowship of kindred spirits who sought to assist

each other in their common desire to experience the Presence of God.

These are an admirable selection of meditations, which will become increasingly helpful as they are given repeated use. We need to grow up to them. They become more and more valuable as one uses them.

The lessons close with a message on *Aspiration* from St. Anselm:

O Thou, Who art where words must cease
Where thought can only bar,
Thy still Eternity is peace
Time-fevered as we are.

O Infinite, none can contain,
No smallness may exclude,
When past the self's extent we gain
Thy spaceless plenitude.

JAMES T. CARLYON

A GUIDE TO THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

By William A. Spurrier. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952. 242 pp. $2.50.

A competent college teacher here sets himself to the task of interpreting the Christian faith to the average and intelligent layman. His experience with college students from the homes of Christian people has equipped him to tell the parents as well as the young people how our faith has been achieved and what is its essential features.

The writer lays no claim to originality or to authority in what he has attempted. The work does, as the author desires, fill a gap in books on religion. It is neither technical nor superficial. The technique of the author is well illustrated by his conclusion to the chapter on "The Christian Interpretation of History". He writes, "It is the Christian faith that the process of history is moral, that it has a purpose, that God is its Lord, that it is therefore essentially meaningful and worth-while, and that its final culmination is the kingdom of God in which we shall all be 'fully known even as we are now known' in fellowship with God."

JAMES T. CARLYON

THESE FOUND THE WAY

By David Wesley Soper. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951. 175 pp. $2.50.

The life story of thirteen women and men who have had unusual experiences on the way to the Christian faith, as represented in the Protestant churches. Joy Davidman, Mildred E. Whitcomb, Joseph Wittkofski, Asa G. Candler, Jr., William L. Gresham, Lee Jordan, Frank R. Snavely, Gerald Kennedy, Chad Walsh, Nels F. S. Ferré, Hyant H. Waggoner, Wingate M. Johnson, and David W. Soper make up the roll.

Let the writer conclude for us. "In all these accounts of intellectual, moral, and spiritual conversion, the common note is the faith each pilgrim has found *at the end of himself*. . . . God is as near as the prayer of self-surrender. And not far away is a fellowship of believers, a Protestant church, where the soul newly surrendered will find strength, and knowledge and love."

JAMES T. CARLYON

THE CITIZEN DECIDES

By Ralph Barton Perry. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1951. 225 pp. $3.00.

As suggestive and timely a book as this reviewer has read in many a moon. It is written by one of the major philosophical minds of our country, long chairman of the department of philosophy at Harvard University, now Professor Emeritus. When Dr. Perry retired from active teaching a few years ago he was given a notable reception and testimonial banquet by his colleagues. It was attended by the outstanding philosophers of America. To them he confided that he had always been a preacher at heart, and in fact had used philosophy as an occasion for preaching the Christian Gospel.

This book is great preaching. It deserves to be read by every teacher and preacher who has any responsibility for moulding public opinion. The sub-title gives clear indication of the author's intention, *A Guide to Responsible Thinking in Time of Crisis.* A listing of chapter headings is an invitation to an intellectual feast: Pity the Poor Citizen, Is Our Side Always Right?, Cliches Labels and Misnomers, Our Many Freedoms, Who Teaches Citizenship?, The Academic

Community of Freedom, The Bad Reputation of Morality, Civic Morals in a Democracy, Are We Against Revolution?, What Price War?, Total Foreign Policy, America and the World, Forgotten Brothers. The preacher who does not get inspired for many a sermon cannot be looking for sermon leads.

Here is a sample sentence for meditation. "Patriotism is one of the loftiest and at the same time one of the most dangerous emotions of which mankind is capable."

JAMES T. CARLYON

PHILOSOPHIES OF INDIA

By Heinrich Zimmer. Edited by Joseph Campbell. New York: Pantheon Books, 1951. xvii + 687 pp. $6.00.

Philosophies of India is the twenty-sixth volume of the massive and distinguished Bollingen Series. Published posthumously, the material has been collected, arranged and put into form for printing by Joseph Campbell, whose own contribution to the work is of genuine importance.

The vast amount of material which any account of Indian philosophies must work with is arranged under three main heads. Under the subject, *The Highest Good,* are treated as introductory problems, the meeting of East and West and the foundations of Indian philosophy. Then are described what are called *The Philosophies of Time,* namely, philosophies of success, pleasure and duty. And finally, *The Philosophies of Eternity,* listed as Jainism, Sankhya and Yoga, Brahmanism, Buddhism, and Tantrism. Thoroughly informed in the history of philosophy in the West, Zimmer constantly points to parallels and contrasts between Eastern and Western thought. This is one of the most interesting characteristics of the book. Twelve full-page plates reproducing Indian sacred figures or objects greatly enhance the value of the book.

FRED D. GEALY

Concluded from Page 17

holders. All the Presbyterian members were insistent that a Bill of Rights be added, their first demand being that "Liberty of conscience be guaranteed and that the Federal government be denied the right to abrogate or infringe any provision of a state constitution for preservation of liberty, in matters of religion."[2]

In New Hampshire there was one strong Scotch-Irish Presbyterian county, that of Hillsborough, in which the present towns of Londonderry and Derry are located. Of the forty-seven New Hampshire delegates who voted against ratification, ten are known to have been Presbyterians from this area, while almost all the fifty-seven who voted for ratification were Congregationalists, then a state church in the three New England states. Northern Quakers were generally opposed to ratification on the ground that it legalized slavery. Joshua Atherton, the leader of the New Hampshire anti-Federalists, was bitterly opposed to the slavery clauses in the Constitution and stated in a speech before the convention:

> The idea that strikes those who opposed . . . is, hereby . . . conceived (if we ratify the constitution) that we become consenters to and partakers in the sin and guilt of this abominable (slave) traffic, at least for a certain period, without any positive stipulation that it shall even then be brought to an end.[3]

As the above facts show opposition to the ratification of the Constitution stemmed not so much from economic causes as from the fear that the basic freedom, freedom of religion, was not sufficiently protected by its provisions. And there is also considerable evidence to show that the slavery clauses, perpetuating the legality of the slave trade for twenty years, after the Constitution went into effect, offended the tender consciences of not a few.

[2]John Back McMaster and Frederick D. Stone, *Pennsylvania and the Federal Constitution* (Philadelphia, 1888), pp. 13; 712-761; 461 ff.

[3]Charles H. Atherton, *Memoir of the Life of the Honorable Joshua Atherton.* (Boston, 1852) pp. 26-27.

The Seminary Singers are trekking South Texas way for their annual spring trip, April 23-28. Concert engagements have been arranged in Austin, Georgetown, New Braunfels, Victoria, Baytown, Houston and Huntsville, in churches, colleges and high schools. The Singers are under the direction of Dr. Fred D. Gealy. Homer Kluck is president of the group. Bob Scoggin will serve as organist. Larry Meredith, Mike Patison, Dick Raines and Norman Spellman do quartet antics.

CONTENTS

The State of the School . . . . . *Dean Merrimon Cuninggim* 3

An Interpretation of Ministers' Week . . . . . *Earl Marlatt* 7

The Witness of the Church . . . . . *James T. Carlyon* 10

Religion in the Making of the Constitution . . . . . *William W. Sweet* 15

Sin and History . . . . . *William A. Irwin* 18

New Faculty 24

Alumni Notes 25

Book Reviews 28

THE PERKINS SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY JOURNAL

Editor . . . . . *Thomas H. Marsh*
Alumni News . . . . . *James T. Carlyon*
Book Reviews . . . . . *Fred D. Gealy*
Research Articles . . . . . *Wesley C. Davis*
Campus Activities . . . . . *William A. Irwin*

The Perkins School of Theology Journal is edited for the alumni of the school and for the Methodist ministers of the South Central Jurisdiction. The Publications and Publicity Committee of the School of Theology is in charge of the project.

The Journal is published three times a year, during the Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters, by the Perkins School of Theology, with the approval of The Board of Publications of Southern Methodist University.

Southern Methodist University Press

Volume V SPRING NUMBER 1952 Number III